

Serial No.: 09/930,379

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, 12 15-16, 21-22 and 26 are rejected as being unpatentable over a new proposed combination of Dent (United States Patent No. 5,239,557) in view of Abbadessa (United States Patent No. 6,236,856).

The rejection is respectfully traversed because the proposed combination does not teach or suggest the claimed method for operating user equipment in a telecommunications network for receiving packets during a packet service mode, wherein the user equipment (UE) is entered into a discontinuous reception mode when receiving packets, the receiver circuitry is powered down during the packet service mode, while the logical connection is maintained in higher protocol layers during the packet service mode, as recited in the main independent claims 1, 22 and 26 claimed herein.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Dent discloses a system based on CDMA discontinuous reception, but clearly the receiver is not powered down during a packet service mode. Instead, the receiver continues to operate, as described on column 3, lines 33-51, including by decoding one or more other signals. The reasoning in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, page 6, paragraph 1, recognizes this point. In spite of this, Abbadessa does not make up for this deficiency, because Abbadessa

Serial No.: 09/930,379

discloses that a MS 106 in Figure 1 powers down a large part of its circuitry for high percentage of time when in its idle mode, but does not even remotely suggest to do so during a packet service mode when receiving one or more packets. The reasoning in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, page 6, paragraph 2, overlooks this point, including column 7, lines 42-45, of Abbadessa, which merely relates to the known prior art technique of powering down MS circuitry during an idle mode state. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that both cited prior art references fail to teach or suggest the whole thrust of the basic invention.

Moreover, the remaining dependent claims 2-5, 7, 9-10, 12 15-16 and 21 and 26 are similarly rejected based on the proposed combination alone or further in combination with Vembu. Since these claims all contain the aforementioned limitations of the main claim from which they depend, they are believed patentable for the reasons set forth above. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Vembu does not make up for the deficiency in teaching of the proposed combination in relation to the point of novelty of the claimed invention.


The remaining claims 6, 8, 11, 13-14, 17-20 and 27-29 are indicated to allowable.

Serial No.: 09/930,379

Conclusion

For all these reasons, reconsideration and early allowance
of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Barber
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,720

WJB/dap
June 28, 2005